

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 699

JC 840 307

AUTHOR Williams, D. C., Jr.; And Others
TITLE Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College Community Needs and Assessment Survey.
INSTITUTION Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior Coll., Perkinston.; University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg. Bureau of Business Research.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 83
NOTE 96p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Characteristics; Community Colleges; Community Surveys; *Educational Needs; Needs Assessment; Questionnaires; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Community Needs

ABSTRACT

A community needs assessment study was conducted by Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College (MGCJC) to obtain information for program planning and evaluation. Specifically, the study sought to identify educational needs not being met in the district; determine the general attitude of the community toward MGCJC; and measure the impact of the college on the district. Surveys of several groups were conducted to meet these objectives, including (1) a survey of 462 citizens from the four-county MGCJC district; (2) personal interviews with 39 district employers; (3) a survey of 50 public officials; (4) a survey of a sample of 21 civic leaders; (5) a survey of 8,106 high school juniors; (6) a survey of 256 high school teachers and counselors; (7) a survey of 381 MGCJC students representing all six campuses and centers; (8) a survey of 534 MGCJC employees; and (9) a survey of a random sample of 463 former MGCJC students. The study report presents the results of the nine surveys separately, including raw responses for the questionnaire items. The results indicate that the people of the district are proud of MGCJC, are interested in improving education, and are willing to support its efforts to meet the educational needs in the district. (HB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED244699

MISSISSIPPI GULF COAST JUNIOR COLLEGE COMMUNITY NEEDS
AND ASSESSMENT SURVEY

by

D. C. Williams, Jr., Ph.D.
Regina Caveny

Bureau of Business Research
College of Business Administration
University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39406

and

Nell Murray

Institutional Research/Resource Development
Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College
Perkinston, Mississippi 39573

This work is a result of research sponsored in part
by the U.S. Department of Education Title III Insti-
tutional Aid Program, Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior
College and University of Southern Mississippi.

September 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Murray

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

JC 840 307

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work upon which this report is based was financed in part by the U.S. Department of Education Title III Institutional Aid Program, Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College and University of Southern Mississippi. This report is the result of a joint effort by the Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College and the Bureau of Business Research, University of Southern Mississippi. It is intended as a working document for Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College. The completion of this report is attributable to the valuable assistance rendered by many individuals. A special debt of gratitude is owed to the many people who completed questionnaires necessary to the success of this study.

The authors are indebted to a number of people at Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College. Included are: The Community Needs Assessment Survey Committee for guidance in formulating the study objectives, and in preparation and execution of the survey instrument; Ms Shirley Artwright and student service personnel for assistance in distributing the questionnaires.

Recognition is also due the following personnel in the Bureau of Business Research, University of Southern Mississippi: Ms. Brenda Smith and Mr. Ray Huddleston for assistance with the computer analysis of data and preliminary draft of some sections, and Ms. Sarah Curry for typing the manuscript.

Any errors of fact, logic or judgment remaining in the report are the responsibility of the authors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose and Scope of Study	
Methodology	
Limitations	
RESIDENTS SURVEY	6
Programs and Services at MGCJC	
Sources of Information Regarding MGCJC	
Additional Educational Needs for the MGCJC District	
Funding	
Future Enrollment	
Scheduling Preference	
Factors in Selecting a College	
Suggestions	
SURVEY OF RESIDENTS QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES.	12
EMPLOYERS SURVEY	16
Educational Needs	
Evaluation of Services and Facilities	
Modification of Programs	
Employment of MGCJC Students	
Specific Training Needs of Current Employees	
About the Employer	
Follow-up Contact by MGCJC	
Source(s) of Funding	
Suggestions or Comments for Improving MGCJC	
EMPLOYERS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE REPONSES.	21
PUBLIC OFFICIALS SURVEY.	25
Overall Objective	
Course Offerings	
Educational Needs	
Sources of Funding	
PUBLIC OFFICIALS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES.	27
CIVIC LEADERS SURVEY	29
CIVIC LEADERS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES	31

	Page
HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS SURVEY	33
College Attendance	
College Selection	
Level of Education to be Completed	
Occupational or Career Choice	
Planned Attendance at MGCJC	
Factors Influencing Selection of MGCJC	
Skills in Subject Areas	
HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE.	39
HIGH SCHOOL FACULTY AND COUNSELOR SURVEY.	42
Evaluation of MGCJC	
Educational Needs	
Suggestions for Improving Services to Students	
Improving Services to High School Faculty and Counselors	
Information Sources Regarding MGCJC	
Factors in Students' Selection of a College	
Reasons for Recommending MGCJC	
Reasons for Not Recommending MGCJC	
Sources of Funding	
Suggestions for Improving MGCJC	
HIGH SCHOOL FACULTY AND COUNSELOR SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES. .	49
MGCJC STUDENT SURVEY.	52
Course Scheduling	
Effectiveness Rating of MGCJC Personnel and Institution	
Educational Goals	
Service/Facilities	
Alternatives to Attending MGCJC	
Suggestions for Improving MGCJC	
MGCJC STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES.	56
MGCJC EMPLOYEE SURVEY	59
Overall Objectives	
Sources of funds	
Community Service	
Monthly Expenditures	
Suggestions for Improvement of MGCJC	
MGCJC EMPLOYEE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES.	62
FORMER STUDENTS SURVEY.	65
Educational Needs of the District	
Funding	
Classification of Respondents	
Suggestions and Comments for Improving MGCJC	

	Page
FORMER STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES	69
SUMMARY	71
APPENDICES	75
Appendix 1 - Sampling Process	
Appendix 2 - Summary of Suggested Educational Needs MGCJC Should Attempt to Meet	
Appendix 3 - Summary of Suggestions and Comments to Improve MGCJC	

INTRODUCTION

Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College, recognizing its purpose of serving the educational needs of its four-county district, including George, Jackson, Harrison, and Stone counties, contracted with the Bureau of Business Research, University of Southern Mississippi, to conduct a community needs assessment study with funding from Title III, Institutional Aid Program. The survey was conducted to determine educational needs and the effectiveness of the College in meeting those needs.

Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College serves a district with a population of approximately 300,000 persons in the extreme southern part of Mississippi known as the Gulf Coast. The College has three campuses and three centers, with a campus located in each of the four counties. Enrollment in credit programs, academic, technical and vocational, totaled 6,980 in Fall of 1982. An additional 2,524 were enrolled in non-credit programs during 1982-83.

While the College has various ways to determine its effectiveness in specific programs (follow-up of graduates in vocational-technical programs, follow-up studies of transfers to four-year institutions, contact with business community, etc.), a comprehensive needs assessment had never been conducted. Thus, this needs assessment study, while providing information needed in planning and evaluating new programs, will also provide a data base for future studies.

Purpose and Scope of Survey

The Community Needs Assessment Survey was designed to obtain relevant information for program planning and evaluation and to determine the general attitude of the community toward Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College. Specific objectives included:

1. identify educational needs not being met in the District;
2. identify community attitude toward the College;
3. measure the impact of the College on the District.

A survey of several groups was conducted to collect information needed to meet the objectives of the study. The groups included:

1. residents (households) of the District;
2. major employers;
3. public officials, including the Board of Trustees;
4. civic leaders;
5. high school students;
6. high school faculty/counselors;
7. Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College students;
8. Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College employees; and,
9. former students.

The results of the survey will be used in the overall planning and evaluating of College programs and services. More specifically, the data collected will allow the College to:

1. review the effectiveness of existing programs and to examine the potential for new ones;
2. evaluate student and community services being offered;
3. improve student recruitment program by providing basic data necessary for designing a recruitment model;
4. enhance the community's perception of the College;

5. evaluate institutional advertising;
6. identify impacts of College on the community;
7. improve public relations; and,
8. establish base line data for future studies.

Methodology

The data collection was achieved by means of surveying a sample of the various groups. A discussion of the sampling process is included as Appendix 1.

The resident (household) survey was designed based on a random sample of 500 households. The survey was conducted by telephone, thus limiting the results to those households with listed telephones. A total of 462 questionnaires were completed.

Major employers were selected based on representation of employment opportunities in the District. Data were collected by personal interview.

Public officials and civic leaders were surveyed by mail and in group meetings where questionnaires were completed.

Each public high school in the District and two private high schools assisted in the survey by allowing their junior and senior level students to complete questionnaires in their respective high school. Some of the high schools had students complete questionnaires in their classes, while others had students in groups for administering the questionnaires. A total of 5,448, or 67 percent, of all juniors and seniors in the four counties provided information on their plans after high school and pertinent information relative to Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College.

In addition to high school students, the high school faculty and counselors of junior and senior students completed questionnaires.

Personal interviews were also conducted with a number of superintendents, principals, and high school personnel.

Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College students during Spring Semester, 1983, completed questionnaires in classes selected from a random sample of classes in the academic, technical, vocational, and night programs on each of the campus/centers. The questionnaires were administered by the faculty in the respective classes.

A mail survey was conducted of all college personnel. Questionnaires were completed by 46 percent of the college personnel. A mail survey was also the means of data collection of former students. A random sample of 463 former students were mailed questionnaires for completion. The response was 28 percent, or 139 returns from former students.

The questionnaires from the various groups were computer tabulated and analyzed in various ways. Where pertinent, data were broken down by county, by high school, and by campus/center. The consolidated results are summarized and presented herein. Additional data are available to allow analysis of specific counties, high schools, and campus/centers. These data are in tabular form in the Institutional Research and Development Office, Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College.

Limitations

The results of the study are viewed in light of certain limitations. Due to the impossibility of contacting every individual in the District, the limitations of sampling are inherent. In addition, questionnaire design and survey methods, while planned and carried out carefully, have a margin of bias. However, in view of these factors, the results of this survey should accurately reflect the objectives as indicated.

The results of the survey are presented by survey group. As may be noted, the questions varied among groups. The response to the questions is shown in percentages unless otherwise indicated. A list of the questions and a summary of the responses are shown at the end of the discussion for each group, respectively. A complete computer printout with more detailed information was prepared and submitted separately from this report.

Several groups were asked if they feel there are educational needs in the district not currently being met that MGCJC should attempt to meet. For ease of reference and comparison, the results are presented in tabular form in the Appendix. It shows the number of persons from the various groups that made similar suggestions. Respondents were also asked for suggestions for improving MGCJC. These suggestions are presented in the Appendix in a similar manner.

RESIDENTS SURVEY

A total of 462 citizens were sampled from the four counties comprising the MGCJC District. Following a discussion of the survey results, the questionnaire responses are listed. The number contacted in each county was based upon the population of the respective counties. The percentage of the total survey response by county was as follows: Harrison, 50 percent; Jackson, 40 percent; George, 6 percent; and Stone, 4 percent. The majority of the respondents had resided in the MGCJC District for over 10 years (68 percent). Nineteen percent had resided there for less than five years. The remaining 13 percent had a residency of six to ten years. Relative to race, eighty-seven percent were white, 12 percent were black, and one percent fell in the category of "other."

Programs and Services at MGCJC

While the vast majority of those surveyed knew of the college, forty-six percent of the citizens responded that they were familiar with the educational programs and services at MGCJC. These 210 respondents answered questions two through 12 and the results that relate specifically to MGCJC follow.

Only two percent of those familiar with MGCJC gave the college an unsatisfactory rating in serving the community, and another two percent expressed no opinion. Thus, 96 percent approved MGCJC's service to the community as 53 percent ranked this service as excellent and 43 percent ranked it as satisfactory.

Programs or course offerings at MGCJC fall into three general categories: 1) College transfer, 2) technical/occupational, and 3) continuing education. The majority of respondents indicated an awareness of these areas with percentage responses ranging from 51 percent for continuing education up to 65 percent for technical/occupational.

Respondents were also asked to rank the areas as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or excellent. Very few unsatisfactory rankings were given. Each program area received at least 98 percent approval in the form of rankings of satisfactory or excellent.

Over the last five years, 61 percent of either the respondents or members of their households had been enrolled at MGCJC. Fifty-two percent of these were enrolled in college transfer courses, 41 percent in technical/occupational courses, and 17 percent in continuing education courses.

A majority of the respondents (56 percent) were well satisfied with their educational experiences at MGCJC. Forty-two percent expressed satisfaction, and only two percent expressed dissatisfaction. Respondents indicated that their coursework at MGCJC had helped them in the following manner:

Increased the chance for a new or better job (70 percent).

Improved knowledge and skill (79 percent).

Increased personal development (58 percent).

Services offered by MGCJC were ranked using the categories of unsatisfactory, satisfactory and excellent. Each service was rated satisfactory or excellent by the majority of respondents. Both athletic and recreational facilities/activities and meeting rooms received the highest excellent ratings (53 percent and 51 percent, respectively). The cafeteria service was the only area receiving any unsatisfactory rankings (four percent).

Only eight percent of the respondents expressed a need for supportive services being offered at more convenient hours. Three-fourths of these expressed a desire for more Saturday hours with the remaining one-fourth preferring Sunday hours.

Expansion of Services and Programs

Respondents were asked whether certain current services and programs including counseling, cultural activities, community services, developmental education, and recreational should be modified in scope as follows:

- 1 = I don't know
- 2 = Be expanded
- 3 = Stay the same
- 4 = Be cut back

The largest percentage of response each time was that the service or program be expanded, with the next highest response in the category "stay the same." A cutback for any service or program was never suggested by more than three percent of the respondents.

Sources of Information Regarding MGCJC

Respondents were asked to identify the means by which they received information concerning MGCJC. More than one category could be checked. The largest response was in the category of friends and relatives (45 percent); next, were newspapers (40 percent); third, MGCJC students and former students (31 percent); fourth, brochures (24 percent); fifth, television (21 percent); sixth, MGCJC faculty and staff (18 percent); seventh, radio (13 percent); and eighth was high school personnel (8 percent).

Additional Educational Needs for the MGCJC District

Nineteen percent of the respondents felt that there were educational needs in the MGCJC district that were not currently being met. Their

specific suggestions are listed in Appendix Table 2. Most of the suggestions related to computer or computer-related courses, and it should be noted that the survey was conducted prior to the college's expansion of its computer equipment and program offerings.

Funding

When asked to identify the major source(s) of any new funding for the college, citizens responded in the following manner: 51 percent felt state funds should provide new funding; 39 percent, federal funds; 21 percent, local millage; 21 percent, student tuition and fees; 16 percent, donations and gifts to the college; and 6 percent, private foundations. The percentage of response for each category of funding can also be broken down by county in which the respondents resided. The results are as follows:

Sources of New Funding	County				Total
	George	Harrison	Jackson	Stone	
State Funds					
Number	8	56	38	6	108
Percent	29	34	33	21	32
Federal Funds					
Number	2	22	15	4	44
Percent	7	13	14	14	13
Local Millage					
Number	12	37	24	8	81
Percent	43	23	21	27	24
Student Tuition					
Number	2	23	16	2	43
Percent	7	14	14	7	13
Donations and Gifts					
Number	2	13	11	5	31
Percent	7	8	10	17	9
Private Foundations					
Number	2	13	9	4	28
Percent	7	8	8	14	9
Total Responses					
Number	28	164	114	29	335
Percent	100	100	100	100	100

Future Enrollment

The remainder of the results are based on the frequency distribution of all 462 citizens who participated in the survey.

Twenty-four percent of the respondents in the Residential survey planned to enroll at MGCJC within the next two years. Forty percent of these would be full time and the remaining 60 percent would be part time. Eighty-five percent would be enrolled for credit and 15 percent for non-credit courses.

Scheduling Preference

Relative to the selection of a course of study and scheduling preference if they were to take a course at MGCJC fourteen percent of the residents surveyed (65 respondents) expressed a desire to enroll in college transfer courses. When asked for a time preference, 63 percent selected attending class during the day 42 percent preferred evening classes; 9 percent chose Saturday classes; and 5 percent chose TV.

Ten percent, 46 respondents, expressed a desire to enroll in technical/occupational courses. Fifty percent of these preferred both day and evening classes; 17 percent chose Saturday classes; and 9 percent chose TV.

An interest in the continuing education courses was expressed by five percent of the residents. The respondents preferred to take the continuing education classes in the evening or on Saturday.

Factors in Selecting a College

The question on factors in making a decision on college selection varies from the reasons recently stated by the college on why a student attends MGCJC. When asked to choose the factor(s) that are important in selecting a college, 50 percent of the residents chose both nearness to home and quality of instruction. Program offerings were indicated by 47 percent of the residents as an important factor in selecting a college; cost was a selection

factor for 37 percent of the respondents. "Other" factors were cited by only three percent.

Suggestions

Residents had some suggestions for improving MGCJC. They ranged from general comments to specific courses. For example, a few suggested improved advertisement of the MGCJC programs. Improved student services, such as counseling and improvements in registration, were suggested. The number of people offering any specific suggestion was relatively small; however, the specific suggestions are shown in the Appendix.

SURVEY OF RESIDENTS QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

(462 respondents)

ABOUT GCJC:

1. Are you familiar with the educational programs and services of GCJC?

Yes 46

No 54

2. How well do you feel GCJC is serving the community?

Unsatisfactorily 2

Satisfactorily 43

Excellently 53

No opinion 2

3. At GCJC, course offerings are available in three categories. Of which of the program areas are you aware and how would you rank them? (Check as many as are appropriate) Rank: 1-Unsatisfactory, 2-Satisfactory, 3-Excellent.

	Awareness	Rank		
		1	2	3
College transfer courses	62	2	61	37
Technical/occupational courses	65	2	62	36
Continuing education	51	1	63	36

4. Have you or a member of your household enrolled in a course program at GCJC during the last five years?

No (SKIP to question 7) 38

Yes (Please check the type of courses or program(s) in which you or a member of your household were enrolled.) 61

College transfer courses 52

Technical/occupational courses 41

Continuing education 17

5. How satisfied were you with your educational experience(s) at GCJC?

Dissatisfied 2

Satisfied 42

Well satisfied 56

6. Did the GCJC courses or programs help you and/or other members of your household in the following ways?

Increase chance for new or better job	70
Improve knowledge and skill	79
Increase personal development	58

7. Have you attended or made use of any of the following services offered by GCJC in the last two years? Rank: 1-Unsatisfactory, 2-Satisfactory, and 3-Excellent.

	Yes	No	Rank		
			1	2	3
Library	42	58	0	67	33
Career Counseling	19	81	0	58	42
Concerts and theater	30	70	0	58	43
Athletic and recreational facilities/activities	28	72	0	47	53
Meeting rooms	14	86	0	49	51
Cafeteria	22	78	4	74	22

8. Are supportive services (library, basic skills labs, computer lab) offered at convenient hours?

Yes	92	If no, what time would you prefer?	Day	0
No	8		Night	25
			Saturday	75
			Other	0
			Specify	_____

9. Do you think the following services and programs currently provided by MGCJC should be expanded, stay the same, or be cut back?

1 = I don't know 3 = Stay the same
2 = Be expanded 4 = Be cut back

	1	2	3	4
Cultural activities for the community	14	49	34	3
Academic counseling	14	49	36	1
Job/career counseling	11	51	36	2
Community services, noncredit courses	16	46	36	2

	1	2	3	4
Development/remedial education	15	48	35	2
Recreational activities	14	44	39	3

10. How have you learned about the educational courses, programs, services, and facilities offered by GCJC? Check (✓) all that apply.

GCJC faculty and staff	18
GCJC students and former students	31
High school personnel	8
Radio	13
Newspapers	40
Television	21
Friends and relatives	45
Brochures	24

11. Are there any educational needs in the GCJC District that GCJC should be attempting to meet, but is not meeting at the present time?

Yes	19
No	65
No response	16

12. Which of the following do you think should be the major source(s) of any new funding?

State funds	51
Local millage (property taxes)	21
Federal funds	39
Student tuition and fees	21
Donations and gifts to the college	16
Private foundations	13

13. Do you intend to enroll in GCJC within the next two years?

Yes	24	if yes,	Full time	40
No	76		Part time	60
			Credit	85
			Noncredit	15

14. If you were to take a course at GCJC, which would you prefer? (Check as many as are appropriate)

	Program	Time			
		Day	Evening	Saturday	TV
College transfer courses	14	63	42	14	8
Technical/occupational courses	10	50	50	17	9
Continuing education	5	18	73	27	18

15. What factors are important to you in selecting a college? (May check more than one)

Cost	37
Nearness to home	50
Program offerings	43
Quality of instruction	50
Other	3

16. ABOUT YOU:

- A. How many years have you lived in the GCJC District?

Less than 5 years	19
6-10 years	13
Over 10 years	68

- B. What is your racial background? Please check only ONE.

Black	12
White	87
Other	1

17. Do you have any suggestions or comments which you feel would help improve GCJC?

18. County of Residence:

George	6
Harrison	50
Jackson	40
Stone	4

EMPLOYERS SURVEY

Thirty-nine employers who were representative of employment opportunities in the District were included in this sample. These employers were personally interviewed to determine the degree of satisfaction with MGCJC, the college's impact on the firm and the training needs of the employer. Sixty percent of those contacted were manufacturing firms and the others were in the services category. The distribution of the firms among the counties in the district was: George, 15 percent; Harrison, 49 percent; Jackson 28 percent; and Stone, 8 percent. The questionnaire responses of the employer survey follow.

Given the purpose of MGCJC, the employers were complimentary of the college. All of the respondents felt that MGCJC was achieving its goal either satisfactorily (30 percent) or excellently (70 percent). Two of those interviewed felt they had not lived in the district long enough to respond to the question.

Educational Needs

Approximately one-fourth of the employers mentioned educational needs in the district that they felt the college should attempt to meet that are not being met at the present time. Stressing requirements in the basic education of reading, math and writing skills was mentioned most often. The respondents suggested that this be a requirement not only at the junior college level but also in high schools. The need for more flexibility in class scheduling to meet continuing education needs and to

accommodate shift workers was suggested. Specific training needs mentioned most often were technical electronics, instrument repair training, and other computer related courses/programs.

Evaluation of Services and Facilities

The percentage of the employers that were aware of the services and facilities listed in the questionnaire ranged from 31 percent regarding upgrade training to 82 percent aware of conferences, seminars, and workshops. Of those aware of the respective programs, the highest percentage of use was meeting rooms, 60 percent. The service that employers used the least was internship and field placement services. The number of the 39 employers interviewed that used the respective services ranged from five using internship and field placement services to 18 using meeting room facilities. Of those employers who had used the facilities with exception of two, all were satisfied.

Modification of Programs

The number of employers responding to program modification was relatively small. Some of them expressed the feeling that they were not familiar enough with the program to suggest changes. Of those responding, the largest percentage felt that the programs listed should remain the same with range from 63 percent for in-plant training to 77 percent for start-up training. The program with the highest percentage suggesting expansion was the co-op program, 25 percent. It is noteworthy that, in general, those suggesting that the program remain the same, or be expanded, felt that it is a good program and should be continued and/or expanded if there is sufficient demand for the program.

Employment of MGCJC Students

Ninety-five percent of the employers indicated they presently employ

persons who have taken courses at the college. Of those, 86 percent indicated the course work was related to the job. And, all of those were satisfied with the quality of the training the employees received at MGCJC. For example, 42 percent indicated the training was satisfactory and 58 percent indicated it was excellent.

Comments regarding this series of questions indicated that a number of the employers felt that although the training which students receive at MGCJC is good, on-the-job training is necessary to become familiar with specific requirements of the firm and to become proficient. This is not to suggest that a higher level of training is needed at the college level. Associated with this feeling, several of the employers commented that some students in the various fields feel that they are ready for management positions and/or advanced work and pay level upon completion of the training at the college. However, on-the-job training and/or work experience is necessary before qualifying for such positions.

Specific Training Needs of Current Employees

Seventeen, or 47 percent, of the employers indicated current employees need training. Most of them would not project such training needs, however, because of uncertainties in the economy, etc. Thus, care should be taken in interpreting the data shown for future training needs. Also, a word of caution regarding current training needs seems in order. As noted by several of the employers, the fact that the employer feels employees need training does not necessarily mean the employee would take the training even if it were offered.

A list of the training needs indicated is shown below.

Supervisory
Sales & Purchasing
Accounting
Fitters
Welders

Machinist
 Electronics
 Sewing Machine Mechanics
 Numerical Control
 Registered Nursing
 Medical Transcriber
 Blue Print Readers & Reading Measuring Equipment
 Communication Journalism
 Chemical Operation Trainer
 Pneumatic Instrument Repair
 Hydraulics
 Electrical Maintenance
 Social Service
 Data Processing

The approximate number of employees in the organizations surveyed was 22,000. Employment ranged from 8 to 9,800. The median was 175. The projected total number of employees in 1985 was made by some of the employers, with very few predicting as far as 1990. Respondents were unsure of the future of the economy and other factors, and thus, were reluctant to make projections. However, those employers making a projection for 1985 and 1990 did expect to have an increase in the number of employees, barring a continuing unfavorable economy.

About the Employer

Employers were asked to identify the three major classifications in which increased employment was anticipated. The ones listed are as follows:

Registered Nurse	Sales
Tellers	Welders
Data Processing	Paper Patterns
Secretarial	Machinist
Licensed Practical Nurse	Telecommunications
Medical Technology	Advertising
X-Ray Technology	Kitchen-Food Personnel
Maintenance	Housekeeping
Machine Operators	
Supervision	
Blue Collar	
Mechanics	
Electricians	
Ship Fitters	
Chemical Operator	
Paper Makers	

Relative to tuition assistance as a service to their employees, 75 percent of the respondents did offer tuition assistance to their employees; 21 percent responded that they offered no tuition assistance.

Follow-Up Contact by MGCJC

Forty-one percent of the employers responded that they would be interested in having further contact by a MGCJC training program specialist. A total of 18 employers provided information needed for consultation purposes. A list of those employers is provided separate from this report.

Source(s) of Funding

Respondents were asked to identify what they think should be the major source(s) of new funding for programs and services at MGCJC. They could identify more than one source. The sources they suggested and the percent of the respondents suggesting it as a source are as follows:

<u>Source</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents Suggesting it</u>
Local Millage (property taxes)	36
Student Tuition and fees	33
State funds	31
Federal funds	8

Local taxes, student tuition and fees, and state taxes were mentioned with about equal frequency. A few suggested federal funds as a major source. According to employers, the fact that they identified what they felt should be major sources of additional funds for MGCJC if new funds are needed does not necessarily mean that they felt the MGCJC should obtain more funds. A general consensus was that taxes are already high enough.

Suggestions or Comments for Improving MGCJC

A few suggestions were offered for improving MGCJC. The number of people suggesting any one factor was rather small. The suggestions are listed in the Appendix.

EMPLOYERS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

(Sample size 39)

The overall purpose of GCJC is to provide educational programs and services needed by the residents of the Gulf Coast Junior College Community beyond the high school level. The education and training provided by GCJC are intended to help students obtain the knowledge and skills needed for educational and occupational career advancement, personal development, and recreational development.

1. Given this overall purpose of GCJC how well do you feel GCJC is achieving this goal? Number responding 37.

	<u>Percent of Response</u>
Unsatisfactorily	0
Satisfactorily	30
Excellently	70

2. Are there educational needs in the District you feel GCJC should be attempting to meet, but is not meeting at the present time?

	<u>Percent of Response</u>
Yes	8
No	84
No response	8

ABOUT GCJC'S IMPACT ON YOU AS AN EMPLOYER

Listed below are a number of services/facilities which are viewed by GCJC as being of potential use to various employers. For each service/facility listed below, please indicate:

Are you aware of this service/facility?	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Conferences, seminars or workshops	32	82	7	18
Job Placement services	29	74	10	26
Internship & Field placement services	17	44	22	56
Consultation services by GCJC faculty/staff	17	44	22	56
Meeting room facilities	30	77	9	23
In plant training	25	64	14	36
Upgrade training	12	31	27	69

If yes, have you used it?

	Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Conferences, seminars or workshops	11	35	20	65
Job Placement Services	13	45	16	55
Internship & Field placement services	5	29	12	71
Consultation services by GCJC faculty/staff	10	59	7	41
Meeting room facilities	18	60	12	40
In plant training	8	32	17	68
Upgrade training	7	58	5	42

Were you satisfied - if used?

Conferences, seminars or workshops	11	100	0	0
Job Placement services	11	92	1	8
Internship & Field placement services	5	100	0	0
Consultation services by GCJC faculty/staff	10	100	0	0
Meeting room facilities	18	100	0	0
In plant training	8	100	0	0
Upgrade training	6	86	1	14

4. Should the following be modified?

	Number Responding	Percent Responding		
		Cut back 1	Same 2	Expand 3
In-plant training	19	16	63	21
Start-up training	17	18	77	6
Co-op program	20	5	70	25
Upgrade training	22	9	68	23

5. Does your organization presently employ persons who have taken courses at GCJC?

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of Response</u>
Yes	37	95
No	2	5
Not sure	0	0

6. Were these courses related to their jobs?

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of Response</u>
Yes	31	86
No	5	14
Not sure	0	0

7. How would you rate the quality of training these employees received at GCJC?

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of Response</u>
Unsatisfactory	0	0
Satisfactory	13	42
Excellent	18	58

8. Are there specific kinds of training, including high technology, needed by your employees? If any, please list below.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of Response</u>
Yes	17	47
No	19	53

ABOUT YOU AND YOUR ORGANIZATION

9. In your organization, what is the approximate number of employees?

Current 21,561

10. List the three major job classifications in which you anticipate increased employment.

11. What is your firm's industrial classification?

12. Does your firm offer tuition assistance to your employees?

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of Response</u>
Yes	30	79
No	8	21

13. Would you be interested in having a GCJC training program specialist contact you about your manpower training needs?

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of Response</u>
Yes	16	43
No	21	57

14. What do you think should be the major source(s) of additional funds that may be needed by MGCJC?

<u>Source</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>
Local millage (property taxes)	36
Student tuition and fees	33
State funds	31
Federal funds	8

PUBLIC OFFICIALS SURVEY

A total of 50 public officials were sampled with 44 (88 percent) completing the survey forms. Fifty percent of the respondents were MGCJC Board of Trustee members, and the other 50 percent were nonboard members.

Overall Objective

All of the respondents felt that MGCJC was achieving its overall objectives at least satisfactorily. Moreover, nearly half of the public officials felt that MGCJC was doing an excellent job in meeting its overall objectives.

Course Offerings

Respondents were asked to rank the course offerings in three areas (college transfer, technical/occupational and continuing education) using the categories of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, excellent and don't know. In addition, they were asked if these programs should be expanded, cut back or remain the same.

Very few unsatisfactory rankings were given, and for each course area approval in the form of a satisfactory or excellent was indicated by at least 70 percent of the respondents. Continuing education was the only course offering for which a cutback was suggested. Expansion of each area was recommended by more than half the respondents.

Educational Needs

Twenty-five percent of the public officials feel that there are educational needs in the district not currently being met by MGCJC. Their specific suggestions are listed in the Appendix. Other suggestions for improving

MGCJC are also listed in the Appendix.

Sources of Funding

Respondents were asked to identify the major source(s) of new funding for programs and services at MGCJC. Seventy-three percent chose state funds. Federal funds were considered to be a major source of new funding by 48 percent of the public officials. Student tuition and fees and local millage (property taxes) were selected by 32 and 30 percent, respectively. Donations and gifts and private foundations each were indicated by approximately a fifth of the respondents.

PUBLIC OFFICIALS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

About GCJC

1. Given the overall objective, how well do you feel GCJC is achieving this goal?

	<u>Percent Response</u>
Unsatisfactorily	0
Satisfactorily	55
Excellently	45

2. At GCJC, course offerings are available in three categories. How would you rank them and do you feel they should be expanded or cut back? Rank: 1-Unsatisfactory, 2-Satisfactory, 3-Excellent, and 4-Don't know.

	<u>Rankings</u>				<u>Number Responding</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	
College transfer courses	18	46	32	4	29
Technical/occupational courses	15	33	37	15	27
Continuing education	4	48	30	18	27

	<u>Offerings should be</u>			<u>Number Responding</u>
	<u>Expanded</u> <u>1</u>	<u>Cut back</u> <u>2</u>	<u>Remain the same</u> <u>3</u>	
College transfer courses	65	0	35	40
Technical/occupational courses	82	0	18	38
Continuing education	58	3	39	38

3. Are there any educational needs in the District that GCJC should be attempting to meet, but is not meeting at the present time?

	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	25
No	59
No response	16

4. Which of the following do you think should be the major source(s) of new funding for programs and services at MGCJC?

	<u>Percentage Responding</u>
State Funds	73
Local Millage (property taxes)	30
Federal funds	48
Student tuition and fees	32
Donations and gifts	21
Private foundations	18

5. Please list any suggestions or comments which you feel would help improve MGCJC?

(See Appendix)

CIVIC LEADERS SURVEY

A small sample of 21 civic leaders participated in the MGCJC survey. All of the respondents gave MGCJC a satisfactory or excellent rating in service to the community. Only three respondents indicated the presence of educational needs in the area that were not currently being met. Specifically identified were basic secretarial skills and continuing education courses for adults.

The civic leaders were asked to select the major source(s) of new funding for programs and services at MGCJC. More than one source could be indicated. Thirteen respondents (62 percent) thought that state funds should be a major source of new funding. Student tuition and fees were selected 10 times (48 percent). The other sources, local millage, federal funds, donations and gifts and private foundations, received comparable response rates with 4 or 5 respondents each.

The civic leaders were asked to name two things that MGCJC is doing well. The following items were listed:

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>
Good teachers	2
Ease of entrance	1
Vocational programs & adult ed	6
Providing ed. opp. to young people	2
Health professional programs	1
Computer field	1
Preparing students for 4 yr. college	4
Involving the community	3
2 + 2 program	1
Good P.R. program	1
Offer a wide variety of night classes	1

The following list contains the responses that were given by the civic leaders when asked to name two things that MGCJC is not doing well.

Number of Respondents

None	3
Not adequately teaching general office skills	1
Planning on classroom & dormitory additions	2
Publicity to post college age pros- pective students	1
Cultural events for community	1
Placement activities & counseling	1
Maintaining high academic standards	1
Registration-not very well organized	1

Additional comments for improving MGCJC received from the civic
leaders are listed in the Appendix.

CIVIC LEADER SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES
(Percentage)
(Sample Size 21)

The overall objectives of GCJC are:

- A. Offering college-transfer programs consisting of courses leading to college degrees.
- B. Providing technical and vocational programs designed to prepare the student for immediate employment, with emphasis on serving community needs.
- C. Serving continuing education needs through varied programs, courses, and activities.
- D. Promoting and encouraging educational and cultural activities in the community through the facilities and resources of the college.

In view of the objectives:

1. How well do you feel GCJC is serving the community?

Unsatisfactorily	0	No Response	5
Satisfactorily	62		
Excellently	33		

2. Are there educational needs in the community that GCJC should be meeting, but is not meeting at the present time?

Yes	14
No	57
No response	29

3. Which of the following do you think should be the major source(s) of any new funding for programs and services at GCJC?

State funds	62
Local millage (property taxes)	19
Federal funds	24
Student tuition and fees	48
Donations and gifts	19
Private foundations	19

4. Name two things that GCJC is doing well.
5. Name two things that GCJC is not doing well.
6. Please list any suggestions or comments which you feel would help improve GCJC. See Appendix.

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS SURVEY

The total number of high school students in the junior and senior grade available for sampling in the MGCJC District was 8,106 (according to the 1982-1983 fall enrollment figures). The survey forms were completed by those juniors and seniors available on the day the questionnaires were administered. With 5,448 completed questionnaires, the response rate was 67 percent. The students attended the following high schools.

<u>High School</u>	<u>Percent</u>
George County	7
d'Iberville	5
Harrison Central	10
Pass Christian	3
Biloxi	11
Gulfport	8
Long Beach	8
East Central	3
Saint Martin	7
Vancleave	3
Moss Point	10
Ocean Springs	7
Pascagoula	10
Stone	4
Mercy Gross	2
Saint John	2

Fifty-one percent of the respondents were seniors, 48 percent classified themselves as juniors and the remaining one percent were noncommittal. Seventy-six percent were white, 22 percent were black, and two percent fell in the category of "other." Fifty-one percent of the respondents were female, 48 percent male, and the remaining one percent were noncommittal.

The survey results are reported in terms of percentage of response. Occupational information is given by specific job titles as well as being categorized by general majors. The results presented herein include a

consolidated summary. An analysis of specific high school results will likely provide the most significant planning data. These data are available in tabular form by county and by high school in the Institutional Research and Development Office, MGCJC.

College Attendance

Seventy-two percent of the high school students indicated that they plan to attend college, 18 percent were undecided, and the remaining 10 percent expressed plans of not attending college. When asked to specify which college they would attend, of those planning on attending college, forty percent chose MGCJC, 26 percent were undecided, 10 percent chose the University of Southern Mississippi, 5 percent chose Mississippi State University, 2 percent chose the University of Mississippi, and the remaining 17 percent chose other institutions. Thirty-five percent of the total sample, i.e., 1,897 high school students, planned to attend MGCJC.

College Selection

The high school students were asked to check those factors which influenced their decision in selecting a college. More than one factor could be selected. Thirty-five percent answered that closeness to home was a factor in deciding which college to attend. Curriculum related factors received a high response as 34 percent chose program offerings and 30 percent indicated that quality of programs were major factors in their selection of a college. Cost was an important factor for 26 percent of the sample.

Those not selecting MGCJC (comprising 65 percent of the total sample) were also asked to identify factors influencing their decision. The two categories receiving the greatest response were curriculum related. Specifically, 15 percent did not choose MGCJC because it does not offer a four-year program, and 11 percent cited course offerings as the reason for not

selecting to attend MGCJC. Closeness to home was identified as a negative factor by 10 percent. Other negative influences included recommendations from parents, friends and relatives (5 percent) and from teachers and counselors (1 percent). The academic reputation of MGCJC was given by 4 percent as the reason for not choosing the junior college.

Level of Education to be Completed

Forty-two percent of respondents planned to complete a 4-year degree; 20 percent, 2 years of college; 19 percent expressed a desire to advance beyond a B.S. degree; three percent plan to attend college for one year; 14 percent will complete only high school; and the remaining two percent were in the category of no response.

Occupational or Career Choice

Twenty-five percent of the respondents were undecided about an occupational or career choice at the time of the survey. The remaining respondents expressed a first, second, and third choice for a college major. The top five preferred job titles chosen as first choice were: 1) Data processing/computer science (9.4 percent), 2) Engineering (7.4 percent), 3) Nursing (6.4 percent), 4) Accounting (6.0 percent), and 5) Business Administration (5.6 percent).

The second choice top five job titles were: 1) Data processing/computer science (6.8 percent), 2) Accounting (5.5 percent), 3) Business Administration (5.0 percent), 4) Engineering (3.3 percent), and 5) Nursing (3.0 percent). Fifty-three percent of the respondents made a second choice.

A third choice was made by 42 percent of the respondents. Their top five occupational preferences were: 1) Data processing/computer science (5.0 percent), 2) Business Administration (4.5 percent), 3) Office management (3.8 percent), and Accounting (3.5 percent), 4) Fashion Merchandising

(2.9 percent) and Law (2.8 percent), and 5) Teaching (2.2 percent), Engineering (2.5 percent) and Nursing (2.4 percent). Table 1 gives the number and percentage of respondents for each of the six general areas. For all choices, the most frequently selected area was Business and Management, which received approximately a third of the responses each time. Social and Personal Services was the area receiving the least response, less than 10 percent for each choice.

Planned Attendance at MGCJC

Thirty-eight percent of the sample (2,053 students) responded to the section that indicated plans to attend MGCJC. Sixty-two percent of these plan on attending on a full time basis, and the remaining 38 percent as part time students.

Factors Influencing Selection of MGCJC

Students who were planning to attend MGCJC were asked to identify the factors that were important in their plans to attend. More than one factor could be chosen by a student. Parents and relatives were cited as an important influence by 55 percent of the respondents. Thirty-seven percent indicated advice from friends in their selection of MGCJC. Students at MGCJC were cited as the factor influencing their decision to attend MGCJC by 22 percent of the sample; brochures and catalogues, 17 percent; high school teachers and counselors, 15 percent. Other factors contributing to the student's selection of MGCJC included MGCJC faculty and staff, 6 percent, and television, radio and newspapers, each 2 percent.

Purposes for Attending MGCJC

Respondents who planned to attend MGCJC were also asked to identify the purpose(s) of their course work. Most frequently cited were developing skills for a new job and preparing for transfer to a four-year college (42 percent each). Thirty-four percent indicated course work at MGCJC

TABLE 1
OCCUPATIONAL MAJORS BY HEADINGS AND SUBHEADINGS

	First Choice		Second Choice		Third Choice	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Social and Personal Services	244	7	240	8	209	9
Business and Management	1,097	32	921	32	726	31
Trades, Crafts and Industries	412	12	435	15	364	16
*Human Services Crafts and Industries	72	2	69	2	52	2
*Machine Operation, Repair, Servicing	228	7	232	8	118	8
*Construction and Related	68	2	68	2	62	3
*Agricultural Production	44	1	66	2	69	3
Technologies	473	14	319	11	283	12
Arts and Sciences	503	15	450	16	342	15
Health Services	733	21	526	18	388	17
Total Responding	3,462	100	2,891	100	2,312	100
Percentage Response	64		53		42	

*These are subgroups of Trades, Crafts and Industries.

for the purpose of career exploration. Nine percent were planning to upgrade employment skills in their present job and seven percent indicated that they planned to take courses for pleasure or enrichment.

Skills in Subject Areas

In an effort to assist in planning developmental programs, high school students were asked to evaluate their competence level in the basic education skills of reading, writing, math, and science. The majority of respondents rated themselves as good in each of the subject areas. Math and science skills received the greatest number of poor ratings with 14 percent of the students recognizing their weakness in these areas. Students considered themselves best prepared in their reading skills. The complete results may be found in the questionnaire response at the end of this section.

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES (Percentage)

Section I

1. Do you plan to attend college?

Yes	72
No	10
Undecided	18

A. If yes, where?

Gulf Coast Junior College	40
University of Southern Mississippi	10
Mississippi State University	5
University of Mississippi	2
Other (specify)	17
Undecided	26

B. Check the following factors which influenced your decision in selecting a college.

Cost to attend	26
Nearness to home	35
Quality of programs	30
Program offerings	34
Other	16

C. If you did not select GCJC, why?

GCJC too close to home	10
Does not offer four-year program	15
High school teacher/counselor recommendation	1
Parents, friends, relatives	5
Academic reputation	4
Course offerings	11
Other	20

2. What is the highest level of education you plan to complete?

High school	14	4 year degree	42
1 year	3	Advanced degree beyond B.S.	19
2 year	20	No response	2

3. What are your choices for a college major?

Section II

4. Do you plan to attend GCJC?

Full time	62
Part time	38

5. Which of the following were factors influencing your decision to select GCJC?

Parents or relatives	55	Television	2
Friends	37	Radio	2
High school teacher or counselor	15	Newspaper	2
GCJC students	22	GCJC brochure/catalogue	17
GCJC faculty or staff	6	Other	15

6. What are your reasons for taking courses at GCJC?

To transfer to a four-year college	42
To develop skills for a new job	42
To upgrade employment skills for present job	9
For pleasure or enrichment	7
Career exploration	34

Section IIIAbout You

7. A. Are you

Male	49
Female	51

B. Race

Black	22
White	76
Other	2

C. Rate your skills in the following subject areas:

	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>No Response</u>
Reading	4	52	42	2
Writing	7	60	31	2
Math	14	58	26	2
Science	14	62	22	2

D. What is your high school classification?

Junior	48
Senior	50
No response	2

8. Please list any suggestions or comments which you feel would help improve GCJC. (See Appendix)

HIGH SCHOOL FACULTY AND COUNSELOR SURVEY

Questionnaires were distributed to teachers and counselors of eleventh and twelfth grade students in the high schools of the MGCJC District. A total of 256 high school faculty and counselors completed the survey form. Sixty-two percent of the high school faculty and counselors had attended a junior college or a community college. The respondents were employed at the following high schools: George County, 3 percent; d'Iberville, 4 percent; Harrison Central, 6 percent; Pass Christian, 1 percent; Biloxi, 8 percent; Gulfport, 18 percent; Long Beach, 8 percent; East Central, 5 percent; Saint Martin, 12 percent; Vancleave, 4 percent; Moss Point, 3 percent; Ocean Springs, 7 percent; Pascagoula, 13 percent; Stone, 4 percent; Mercy Cross, 2 percent; and Saint John, 3 percent. As in the high school student survey, these data become much more relevant when analyzed by high schools which are available at MGCJC.

Evaluation of MGCJC

The respondents were asked to evaluate various aspects of MGCJC on a scale of poor, good, or excellent. Good or excellent ratings were given for each selected aspect by at least 90 percent of those responding, an indication that MGCJC's contribution to the community is highly regarded. The majority of respondents rated each category as good. The area receiving the highest excellent rating was MGCJC's relationship with the community (38 percent). The areas receiving the highest number of poor ratings (10 percent each) were MGCJC's intellectual environment and the college administration's leadership.

Respondents rated the major types of educational programs at MGCJC using the same scale of poor, good and excellent. Again, the highest percentage of response for each major type of educational program was good. The vocational/technical program received the highest excellent rating (40 percent). The academic/transfer program received the highest poor rating (12 percent). Since good or excellent ratings were given each area by at least 88 percent of the respondents, overwhelming approval of the educational programs at MGCJC may be implied.

Next, the high school faculty and counselors were asked to evaluate how well MGCJC is achieving the purposes of providing education to students. The trend remained as the majority of respondents rated each category as good. Preparing students for transfer to four-year institutions received the highest excellent rating (27 percent). Motivating students to learn received the highest poor rating (12 percent). Again, the favorable ratings by the majority of the high school faculty and counselors indicate approval of MGCJC's performance in providing quality education to students and preparing them for employment or transfer to four-year institutions.

Educational Needs

Only 13 percent of the sample thought there were educational needs in the community which MGCJC was not meeting. The needs identified by these respondents are listed in the Appendix. A significant number of responses did not fall into any one category that would allow a specific need to be identified from this group.

Suggestions for Improving Services to Students

Twenty-two percent of the high school faculty and counselors offered suggestions on how MGCJC could be more responsive in serving high school students. Their responses included:

1. Provide information on which content areas should be emphasized in the college preparatory curriculum and coordinate the high school curriculum with that of MGCJC (18 respondents).
2. Resource help to those with learning disabilities (1 respondent).
3. Administer tests for English placement (1 respondent).
4. Offer academic summer "camps" on campus (1 respondent).
5. More fine arts instruction (3 respondents).
6. Inform high schools of classes and extra programs being held (5 respondents).
7. More advertisement for financial aid, job placement, course offerings, etc. (5 respondents).
8. Send more MGCJC representatives and resource people to high schools earlier in the year (7 respondents).
9. Offer lectures, give tours and seminars on related fields (4 respondents).
10. Work more closely with high school teachers and counselors to provide information about curriculum and school (2 respondents).
11. Provide updated materials on career opportunities (2 respondents).
12. Motivate the students by giving them an understanding of college (2 respondents).
13. Allow students to meet and attend actual college classes (1 respondent).
14. Aid students in understanding the importance of studies in high school (1 respondent).
15. More mailouts (1 respondent).

Several general suggestions and comments were received, including:

1. Doing a good job preparing students for a four-year college (1 respondent).
2. Implement high admission requirements (2 respondents).
3. Make library facilities available to high school students (5 respondents).

Improving Services to High School Faculty and Counselors

Respondents were also asked how MGCJC could aid high school faculty and counselors in their work responsibilities. Suggestions by ten percent of the sample were as follows:

1. Provide a list of curriculum offerings and audio-visual equipment at MGCJC (3 respondents).
2. Allow students to visit on campus to see the program (1 respondent).
3. A program for students planning to teach - aids for grading papers, one-to-one help, etc. (1 respondent).
4. Allow public school teachers to use the library facilities (1 respondent).
5. Offer more workshops (2 respondents).
 - a. for 3 hours credit (1 respondents).
 - b. to motivate students who aren't interested in college (1 respondent).
6. Offer more graduate courses (5 respondents).
 - a. more night/summer graduate courses through University of Southern Mississippi (1 respondent).
 - b. more graduate courses from four-year institutions other than the University of Southern Mississippi (2 respondents).
 - c. to renew certification course offerings (1 respondent).
 - d. additional college credit courses at GCOTC (1 respondent).
 - e. more graduate courses at Jackson County campus (1 respondent).

Information Sources Regarding MGCJC

Ninety-four percent of the respondents felt that information about the college was readily available. Sources of information were identified as: catalog, brochures, etc. (53 percent), newspaper (40 percent), MGCJC students and former students (36 percent), MGCJC faculty/staff (36 percent), friends and relatives (24 percent), television (15 percent), and radio (11 percent).

Factors in Students' Selection of a College

Respondents were asked to identify the major factor(s) in a student's selection of a college. The major factor as perceived by faculty/counselors was cost (63 percent), followed by nearness to home (24 percent), program offerings (23 percent), quality of instruction (16 percent), and other (3 percent).

The three percent category of other included:

1. Varies with an individual's needs and goals (2 respondents).
2. Social reasons (2 respondents).
3. Athletics (1 respondent).
4. Easy admission, low requirements on ACT (1 respondent).
5. Fail in universities and return home to pass in another situation (1 respondent).

Reasons for Recommending MGCJC

When asked to identify the reasons for recommending that a student attend MGCJC, the high school faculty/counselors gave the following ratings: cost (66 percent), nearness to home (39 percent), quality of instruction (32 percent), program offerings (26 percent), quality of teaching faculty (15 percent), and other (7 percent). The other reason cited was that attending MGCJC allows for an easier transition to college, especially for the student who is weak in basic skills, or is less prepared for college emotionally and socially.

Reasons for Not Recommending MGCJC

The high school faculty and counselors were also asked to identify reasons for recommending that a student not attend MGCJC. Each respondent could give more than one reason. Program offerings were most frequently cited (23 percent) as the reason for not recommending MGCJC. Nearness to home was considered a negative factor by 15 percent of the sample. Nine

percent of the high school faculty and counselor group would recommend that a student not attend MGCJC because of the quality of instruction. The quality of the teaching faculty at MGCJC was considered a negative factor by only four percent of the respondents. Cost was not considered a negative factor as it was never selected as a reason for not recommending MGCJC.

Responses in the category of other were:

1. Depends on the individual student's major, motivation and level of intelligence (11 respondents).
2. Students lose credits when transferring (7 respondents).
3. If a program desired wasn't offered, or if a particular program was weak (7 respondents).
4. GPA would be computed on the third and fourth year grades after transferring to a four-year college (1 respondent).
5. Academic standards aren't high enough (4 respondents).
6. It is not a true college experience (3 respondents).
7. Due to the MGCJC administration (2 respondents).
8. A college degree can be obtained more quickly by going directly to a senior college (1 respondent).
9. Location (1 respondent).

Sources of Funding

Respondents were asked to identify the major source(s) of any new funding for programs and services at MGCJC. Fifty percent of the respondents identified state funds. Federal funds and student tuition and fees each received a 26 percent response. The category of private foundations was identified by 15 percent of the respondents. Donations and gifts received a 13 percent response, and local millage (property taxes) was identified by 12 percent.

Suggestions for Improving MGCJC

Responses given by the high school faculty and counselors as comments or suggestions for improving MGCJC are listed in the Appendix. These

comments centered around coordinating with high schools, quality of education, and administration and counseling.

HIGH SCHOOL FACULTY AND COUNSELOR SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES (Percentage)

1. Have you ever been a student at a junior college or community college?

Yes 62

No 35

No response 3

2. Please indicate your opinion on the following items:

	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
The academic reputation of GCJC?	8	61	30	239
GCJC's intellectual environment?	10	69	21	232
The college administration's leadership?	10	70	20	228
GCJC's relationship with the community?	3	59	38	236

3. How would you rate the quality of the major types of educational programs at GCJC?

	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
Academic/transfer	12	62	26	180
Vocational/technical	0	60	40	149
Continuing Education/Noncredit	4	70	25	118

4. How do you feel GCJC is performing in the following areas?

	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
Giving students quality education	8	67	25	211
Motivating students to learn	12	72	16	171
Preparing students for jobs	5	73	22	188
Preparing students for transfer to four-year institutions	11	62	27	209

5. Are there educational needs in the community you feel GCJC should be attempting to meet, but is not meeting at the present time?

Yes 13 If yes, how See Appendix for responses

No 63

No response 23

6. Could GCJC be more responsive in helping you:

A. Serve your students?

Yes 22 If yes, how? See Appendix for responses
 No 58
 No response 20

B. With you work responsibilities?

Yes 10 If yes, how? See Appendix for responses
 No 67
 No response 23

7. Is information about the college readily available?

	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Number</u>
Yes	94	225
No	6	15

If yes, from which major source do you normally get information?

Friends and relatives	24
GCJC faculty/staff	36
GCJC students and former students	36
Newspaper	40
Radio	11
Television	15
Catalog, brochures, etc.	53

8. Of the following, which do you think is the major factor in a student's selection of a college?

Cost	63
Nearness to home	24
Quality of instruction	16
Program offerings	23
Other _____	3

9. Why would you recommend that a student attend GCJC?

Cost	66
Nearness to home	39
Quality of instruction	32
Program offerings	26
Quality of teaching faculty	15
Other _____	7

10. Why would you recommend that a student not attend GCJC?

Cost	0
Nearness to home	15
Quality of instruction	9
Program offerings	23
Quality of teaching faculty	4
Other _____	14

11. Which of the following do you think should be the major source(s) of any new funding for programs and services at GCJC?

State funds	50
Local millage (property taxes)	12
Federal funds	26
Student tuition and fees	26
Donations and gifts	13
Private foundations	15

12. Please list any suggestions or comments which you feel would help improve GCJC? See Appendix for responses

MGCJC STUDENT SURVEY

Surveys were administered to randomly chosen classes of students at each of the six MGCJC campuses/centers during Spring semester, 1983. A total of 381 students completed the survey forms. The percentage of response by campus was:

<u>Campus</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Perkinston	10
Jefferson Davis	32
Jackson County	43
HarCo OTC	4
George County	3
Keesler Center	8

Forty-one percent of the respondents were below age 20; 22 percent between 21 and 24; 21 percent between 25 and 34; 11 percent between 35 and 44; and 5 percent between ages 45 and 54. Eighty-four percent of the respondents were white; 13 percent were black; and the remaining 3 percent fell in the category of "other." Fifty-four percent were male and the remaining 46 percent were female. A majority of the respondents were employed (55 percent).

After completion of the present course work at MGCJC, 46 percent of the students indicated plans to seek employment. Approximately 38 percent plan to transfer to a four-year college. The remaining 16 percent hope to both upgrade their occupational status in present employment and take additional occupational related course work.

The survey results are reported in terms of percentage of response unless otherwise indicated. Comments are included for those items on which respondents offered additional information. The results of the survey are summarized at the end of this section.

As in other survey groups, the results become even more pertinent as responses from specific campuses are analyzed. The campus/center data are

available from the Institutional Research and Development Office, Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College.

Course Scheduling

The students were asked to rank the importance of specified class schedules as being not important, fairly important, and very important. Saturday classes and Friday night classes were not important to the majority of students. A rank of not important was checked by 57 and 56 percent, respectively. Late afternoon classes, after 3:30 p.m., were the most important to the students. Only 26 percent checked them as not important while 41 percent checked them as being fairly important and 33 percent ranked them as being very important. The percentage ranking late afternoon classes as very important was greater than for either of the other three schedules listed.

Courses at home through ETV, while a relatively new effort at MGCJC were considered very important by 16 percent of the students surveyed and fairly important by another 44 percent.

Effectiveness Rating of MGCJC Personnel and Institution

The survey results indicate that the students, as a whole, have a good attitude toward MGCJC as reflected in the subparts of question Number 4. All of the six categories listed received a rating of good or excellent by 90 percent or more of the students. The item receiving the highest excellent rating was effectiveness of MGCJC in meeting the educational needs of the community, 42 percent. Faculty-student relations also received very high marks with only three percent indicating dissatisfaction. MGCJC's intellectual environment was the factor that received the largest percentage of poor ratings.

Educational Goals

The students were asked to rank six educational goals from 1 to 6 with Number 1 being the most important. The goals are listed at the end

of this section. All of the goals were important to the students. For example, the cumulative percentage of the goals receiving a rank of 3 or better ranged from 58 for "provide students with knowledge and interest in community and world problems" to 88 percent for "prepare students with knowledge and skills directly applicable to chosen occupation." The next highest cumulative rating of 3 or above was "prepare students for further formal education."

It is important to note that students clearly indicated that "preparing students with knowledge and skills directly applicable to chosen occupation" was the most important goal for an educational institution as seen by the student.

Service/Facilities

A list of college services or facilities was provided and students were asked to check whether or not they had used the service/facility and to indicate their degree of satisfaction. The results are summarized at the end of this section. The service receiving the lowest usage was job placement service, 18 percent. Also receiving the greatest use was the Admissions Office, 90 percent, and this service received high degrees of satisfaction rating. In general, the students who have used the services/facilities of the college were satisfied. Only two percent of the students surveyed were unsatisfied with the instructional learning labs, while almost one-half of the students indicated they had used the labs.

Alternatives to Attending MGCJC

Students were asked to consider alternatives if MGCJC did not exist in this location. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents would be attending college elsewhere; 21 percent would be working, and the remaining 20 percent were undecided. The impact of the college can thus be viewed from these indications. While a large percentage of students would likely

attend college elsewhere, the cost of being away from home could be much greater. The expenditure would likely be made outside the District which could be a significant economic loss. In addition, a number of students would probably not have the opportunity for postsecondary education.

Suggestions for Improving MGCJC

The students were asked to provide additional comments or suggestions which would help improve MGCJC. These are listed in the Appendix. The majority of these suggestions related to equipment and facilities.

MGCJC STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES
(Percentage)

1. What is your current program emphasis?

Technical/occupational	65
College transfer	30
Other _____	5

2. What are your plans after completing your education here?

Seek employment	46
Transfer to four-year college	38
Other _____	16

3. How much priority should the following schedules be given?
(1 = Not important, 2 = Fairly important, 3 = Very important)

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Courses at home through ETV	40	44	16
Saturday classes	57	32	11
Friday night classes	56	36	8
Early morning classes (prior to 8:00 a.m.)	42	34	24
Late afternoon classes (after 3:00 p.m.)	26	41	33

4. What is your rating of each of the following?

(1 = poor, 2 = good, 3 = excellent)

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Personal relations among faculty	4	66	30
The academic reputation of GCJC outside of the institution	6	68	26
GCJC's intellectual environment	10	68	22
The college administration's leadership	7	70	23
Faculty/student relations	3	59	38
Effectiveness of GCJC in meeting the educational needs of the community	5	53	42

5. Rank the following educational goals according to their importance to you. (Use number 1 through 6, where 1 = most important.)

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Provide students with a broad liberal education	25	16	27	13	9	10
Prepare students with knowledge and skills directly applicable to chosen occupation	60	16	11	5	3	4
Prepare students for further formal education	37	25	14	13	6	5
Provide students with self-knowledge and personal identity	26	20	23	14	8	9
Provide students with knowledge of and interest in community and world problems	20	17	21	15	13	14
Provide students with an understanding and mastery of a special body of knowledge	26	19	21	14	10	10

6. Listed below are a number of resources which are available to you at GCJC. For each service/facility listed, below, please indicate if you have used the resource and degree of satisfaction.

Service/Facility	Have you used this resource?		Degree of satisfaction, if used		
	Yes 1	No 2	Unsatisfied 1	Satisfied 2	Well Satisfied 3
Admissions Office	90	10	7	70	23
Career Development Center	26	74	21	62	17
Counseling					
Academic Advising	55	45	13	66	21
Career Counseling	31	69	16	62	22
Personal Counseling	24	76	11	64	25
Cultural/Social Act.	21	79	13	63	24
Financial Aid Office	46	54	10	45	45
Job Placement Services	18	82	26	53	21
Orientation	55	45	7	72	21
Athletic Facilities	32	68	14	53	33
Student Centered/Open Instructional Learning Labs	47	53	2	60	38

7. Please check your age category

Below 20	41
21-24	22
25-34	21
35-44	11
45-54	5
55-64	0
Over 65	0

8. What is your race?

Black	13
White	84
Other _____	3

9. What is your sex?

Female	46
Male	54

10. Are you currently employed?

Yes	55
No	45

11. If GCJC did not exist, would you be:

Attending college elsewhere	59
Working	21
Don't know	20

12. Please provide any additional comments or suggestions which you feel would help improve GCJC. (See Appendix)

MGCJC EMPLOYEE SURVEY

Questionnaires were distributed to all the employees of Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College. Of the 534 employees, 243 responded to the survey.

The majority of the respondents fell into the 35-49 age category (54 percent), 21 percent in the 50-62 range, 20 percent in the 25-34 category, 3 percent from ages 18-24, and 2 percent age 63 and over. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents were married with the remaining 23 percent classified as single. Also, respondents were classified as 52 percent male and 48 percent female.

The survey results are reported here in terms of percentage of response. Comments are listed under categories identified by the respondents. In addition, the respondents' estimation of their average monthly expenditures is given as a range along with the median value of the interval and the mean. Results of the various questions are summarized at the end of this section.

Overall Objectives

Given the overall objectives of MGCJC, only one percent of the respondents felt that the MGCJC was doing an unsatisfactory job in meeting the stated overall objectives of the institution. Sixty-two percent checked satisfactorily and 39 percent responded that MGCJC was meeting the goals excellently.

In addition, the majority of the respondents felt, overall, that MGCJC was meeting the educational needs of the community. Some of the employees (33 percent) felt there were additional educational needs in the district

that the college should be meeting. These needs are itemized in Appendix Table 2. In summary, the educational needs most often mentioned related to computer related programs and remedial programs.

Sources of Funds

Relative to an opinion of major sources for any new funding, state funds were considered to be the major source by 69 percent of the employees. Respondents felt federal funds, student tuition and fees, and local taxes should be the next major source(s) of new funds, with 36, 33 and 30 percent checking these three sources, respectively. Private foundations and donations and gifts were indicated as a major source of new funds by 13 and 12 percent, respectively.

Community Service

In an effort to determine the impact of the college personnel on the community, participation in community activities were identified. Active service in professional organizations received the highest response (74 percent), followed closely by churches (72 percent). Civic or fraternal clubs were participated in by 42 percent of college personnel; special interest organizations received a 39 percent participation response.

Many of the employees were active in seminars or workshops which received the highest response (62 percent) among the categories of community service activities. Lectures and consulting received a 28 percent response each, followed by other activities (9.5 percent) such as:

Church organizations

Coordinating and attending meetings of nonprofit organizations

Research

Recruiting

Board of Education

Youth programs

Individual and group counseling

Monthly Expenditures

An estimate of household expenditures in the community by college employees indicated that an average of \$1,430 was spent monthly.

Rent or house payments, including taxes, reported by the respondents ranged from \$10 to \$800, with a median of \$250. Utilities ranged from \$10 to \$300, with a median of \$150. Expenditures for food and beverages, on a monthly basis, were \$25 to \$700, and the median was \$250. The range for other retail items was \$15 to \$500 with a median of \$100. Automobile expenses ranged from \$10 to \$700 and the median was \$200. In the category labeled "other" expenditures, there was a range from \$20 to \$550, with a median of \$100.

Suggestions for Improvement of MGCJC

The suggestions mentioned for improving MGCJC were arbitrarily arranged under categories. They are listed in the Appendix. The suggestions most often related to administration and the need for high technology programs.

MGCJC EMPLOYEE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE
(Percentage)

ABOUT GCJC:

The overall objectives of GCJC are to:

- A. Offer college transfer programs consisting of courses leading to college degrees.
- B. Provide technical and vocational programs designed to prepare the student for immediate employment, with emphasis on serving community needs.
- C. Service continuing education needs through varied programs, courses and activities.
- D. Promote and encourage educational and cultural activities in the community through the facilities and resources of the college.

1. Given the overall objectives, how well do you feel GCJC is achieving this goal?

Unsatisfactorily	1
Satisfactorily	62
Excellently	37

2. Are there educational needs in the GCJC District that you feel GCJC should be attempting to meet, but is not meeting at the present time?

Yes	33
No	60
No response	7

3. Which of the following do you think should be the major source(s) of any new funding?

State funds	69
Local millage (property taxes)	30
Federal funds	36
Student tuition and fees	33
Donations and gifts	12
Private foundations	13

4. Please indicate yes/no to the following organizations whether or not you devote active service.

Civic or fraternal clubs	42
Churches	72
Professional organizations	74
Special interest organizations	39

5. Please check the types of community service activities listed below in which you were involved in the past year.

Consulting	28
Lectures	28
Seminars or workshops	62
Other (Specify _____)	10

ABOUT YOU:

6. Please check your age category:

Under 18	0
18-24	3
25-34	20
35-49	55
50-62	21
63 and over	2

7. Are you:

Married	77
Not married	23

8. What is your sex?

Male	52
Female	48

9. Please estimate the average monthly expenditures by your household of the local community for the following:

(Please fill in Estimated
Monthly \$ Admount)
Range

- | | |
|---|------------|
| 1. Rent or house payment including taxes | \$10 - 850 |
| Median = \$250 Mean = \$271 | |
| 2. Utilities (water, gas, electric, telephone,
garbage). | \$10 - 300 |
| Median = \$150 Mean = \$154 | |
| 3. Food and beverages. | \$25 - 700 |
| Median = \$250 Mean = \$288 | |
| 4. Other retail. | \$15 - 500 |
| Median = \$100 Mean = \$144 | |
| 5. Automobile (payments, repairs, gas,
insurance). | \$10 - 700 |
| Median = \$200 Mean = \$229 | |
| 6. Entertainment | \$10 - 300 |
| Median = \$ 50 Mean = \$ 72 | |
| 7. Health (doctors, hospital, dental,
insurance). | \$12 - 700 |
| Median = \$100 Mean = \$ 95 | |
| 8. Other | \$20 - 550 |
| Median = \$100 Mean = \$178 | |
| 10. Please list any suggestions or comments which you feel would help improve
GCJC. (See Appendix) | |

FORMER STUDENTS SURVEY

A random sample of 463 former students were mailed questionnaires requesting information relative to their educational experience at MGCJC. One hundred thirty-one responses were received, for a response rate of 28 percent. Ninety-five percent of the respondents had attended MGCJC in the past 1-5 years, four percent in the last 6-10 years, and one percent over 10 years ago.

Fifty-seven percent of the respondents were enrolled in college transfer courses, 41 percent in technical/occupational courses, and 15 percent in continuing education courses. When asked to rate the level of satisfaction with educational experiences at MGCJC, 59 percent of the respondents were well satisfied; 36 percent marked the category "satisfied," and only five percent expressed dissatisfaction.

The former students indicated that MGCJC courses or programs helped to "improve knowledge and skill" (79 percent); "increase personal development" (57 percent); and "increase chances for new or better job" (47 percent).

Educational Needs of the District

The former students expressed the opinion that MGCJC was meeting the educational needs of the district. Fifty-four percent gave MGCJC a satisfactory rating of meeting the district's educational needs, while 42 percent indicated a rating of excellent. Only four percent responded that needs were being met "unsatisfactorily."

Several of the former students (22 percent) indicated that there were educational needs not currently being met by MGCJC. The specific needs identified by the former students are list in the Appendix.

Funding

Response by former students to the major source(s) of new funding indicates that state funds (53 percent), student tuition and fees (44 percent), and federal funds (43 percent) should be the prime sources of additional funds. Local millage or property taxes received the lowest percentage of responses.

Classification of Respondents

Of the former students surveyed, 64 percent continued education beyond MGCJC. Sixty-one percent of these students received a B.S. degree; 10 percent received an M.S.; and the remaining 29 percent continued their education but have not received a degree.

The majority of the former students responding (54 percent) were employed in the MGCJC district; 14 percent were employed outside the MGCJC district in Mississippi; 11 percent were employed out of state; and the remaining 21 percent did not mark a category.

Since 95 percent of the respondents attended MGCJC within the last five years, their years of experience in the job market were likely to be limited. The annual income data should be viewed in this light. Forty-six percent of the respondents had an annual income between \$10,000-\$19,000; 26 percent fell in the \$20,000-\$29,999 category; 24 percent received less than \$10,000; four percent had an income of \$30,000 and over. For those responding, the median annual income was estimated to be \$17,800.

The former students responding to the survey were enrolled in the following programs at MGCJC. Approximately one-third of the former students did not indicate a specific program.

Number of Respondents

General Core	16
Business Administration	10
Registered Nursing	7
Secretarial Science	7
Licensed Practical Nursing	5
Electronic Technology	5
Education	5
Pre-engineering	4
Construction	3
Drafting	2
Fashion Merchandising	2
Welding	2
Home Economics	2
Law Enforcement	2
Criminal Justice	2
Mechanic	2
Art	1
Psychology	1
Hotel Management	1
Photo Journalism	1
Physical Education	1
Computer Science	1
Medical Technology	1
Radiology Technology	1

Respondents indicated the following as their present occupation:

Number of Respondents

Student	13
Licensed Practical Nursing	7
Registered Nursing	6
Manager	6
Homemaker	5
Unemployed	5
Secretary	4
Teacher	4
Accounting	4
Retail sales	3
Electronic Technician	3
Construction	3
Engineering	3
Military	3
Self-employed	2
Contingencies Planner	2
Shipping Clerk	2
Welding	2
Special Education	2
Music Education	1
Mechanic	1
Pension Coordinator	1

Number of Respondents

Radiology Technician	1
Computer Drafting	1
Civil Service	1
State Trooper	1
Plumber	1
Photolithographer	1
Counselor	1
Detective	1
Real Estate Sales	1
Logistic Analysis	1
Cook	1
Computer Operator	1

Suggestions and Comments for Improving MGCJC

Specific suggestions and comments concerning MGCJC by former students are listed in the Appendix.

FORMER STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES
(Percentage)

ABOUT GCJC:

1. How long ago did you attend GCJC?

1-5 years 95

6-10 years 4

Over 10 years 1

2. Please check the course categories in which you were enrolled?

College transfer courses 57

Technical/occupational courses 41

Continuing education 15

3. How satisfied were you with your educational experiences at GCJC?

Dissatisfied 5

Satisfied 36

Well satisfied 59

4. Please check the boxes that describe how GCJC courses or programs have helped you.

Increased chance for new or better job 47

Improved knowledge and skill 79

Increased personal development 57

5. How well do you feel GCJC is meeting the educational needs of the District?

Unsatisfactorily 4

Satisfactorily 54

Excellently 42

6. Are there educational needs in the GCJC District that GCJC should be attempting to meet, but is not meeting at the present time?

Yes 22

No 66

No response 12

7. Which of the following do you think should be the major source(s) of any new funding?

State funds	53
Local millage (property taxes)	8
Federal funds	43
Student tuition and fees	44
Donations and gifts	15
Private foundations	17

ABOUT YOU:

8. Did you continue your education beyond GCJC?

Yes	64
No	36

If yes, what is the highest level achieved?

B.S.	61	29 percent continued, but did not finish a degree
M.S.	10	
Ph.D.	0	

9. Where are you presently employed?

In GCJC District (George, Harrison, Jackson, and Stone counties)	54
Outside the District in Mississippi	14
Out of state	11
No response	21

10. What is your annual income?

Less than \$10,000	24
\$10,000 - 19,999	46
\$20,000 - 29,999	26
\$30,000 and over	4

SUMMARY

This study was conducted to obtain information needed by MGCJC for planning purposes. The objectives were to identify the attitudes of the community toward MGCJC, to identify educational needs not being met in the district, if any, and to estimate the impact on the district. Nine subgroups of people in the district were surveyed to collect the data needed to meet the objectives of the study. A few of the findings are summarized here.

The people in the district feel that MGCJC is doing a good job in meeting the educational needs in the district. As noted below, only 2 percent of the residents, 4 percent of the former students, and 1 percent of the MGCJC faculty/staff feel that MGCJC is performing unsatisfactorily. All of the others reported that they feel the performance is either satisfactory or excellent.

Evaluation of MGCJC Performance

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Valid Responses</u>	<u>Unsatisfactorily (Percent)</u>	<u>Satisfactorily (Percent)</u>	<u>Excellently (Percent)</u>
Residents	210	2	43	53
Employers	37	0	30	70
Public Officials	44	0	55	45
Former Students	131	4	54	42
MGCJC Faculty/ Staff	241	1	62	37
Civic Leaders	20	0	65	35

Although the people in the district were complimentary toward MGCJC, a small percentage suggested there are educational needs in the district that they would like to see MGCJC attempt to meet. As shown below, the percentage of the various groups that offered suggestions range from 8 percent of the employers to 33 percent of the MGCJC faculty/staff. The specific suggestions are listed in the **Appendix of this report**. The number from any group suggesting a specific educational need was small. The highest number from any group suggesting a specific educational need was from the MGCJC faculty and staff. Thirteen suggested that high technology courses should be offered. The next largest number was from the residents. Five suggested expanded computer courses. The largest number from a sub group suggesting non-academic educational needs came from the high school faculty and counselors. Eighteen suggested that information be provided regarding which content areas should be emphasized in the college preparatory curriculum, and that the high school curriculum should be coordinated with that of MGCJC.

Number Suggesting Educational Needs

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Yes (Percent)</u>	<u>No (Percent)</u>	<u>No Response (Percent)</u>
Residents	210	19	65	16
Employers	39	8	84	8
Public Officials	44	25	59	16
Former Students	131	22	66	12
High School Faculty/ Counselors	256	13	63	23
MGCJC Faculty/Staff	243	33	60	7
Civic Leaders	21	14	57	29

Various groups were asked to identify what they feel should be the major source(s) of funds if additional funds are needed. They were allowed to suggest more than one source. The response is summarized below. The source of funds mentioned most frequently varied somewhat by survey group. For example, the percentage identifying federal funds ranged from 7 for employers to 24 for former students. Overall, state funds were mentioned most frequently, followed by student tuition and federal funds. That some of the people of the district expressed an opinion as to what should be the major source(s) of any new funds does not necessarily mean that they feel more funds are needed.

In conclusion, the results indicate that the people of the district are proud of MGCJC, are interested in improving education and are willing to support its efforts to meet the educational needs in the district.

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO NEW SOURCES OF FUNDING

Group Surveyed (Sample Size)	Types of Funding													
	State Funds		Federal Funds		Local Millage		Student Tuition		Donations and Gifts		Private Foundations		Total Response	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Citizens (462)	108	32	44	13	81	24	43	13	31	9	28	9	335	100
Former Students (131)	69	30	56	24	10	4	57	25	19	8	22	9	233	100
Public Officials (44)	32	33	21	22	13	13	14	15	9	9	8	8	97	100
Employers (39)	12	29	3	7	14	33	13	31	0	0	0	0	42	100
Civic Leaders (21)	13	33	5	13	4	10	10	25	4	10	4	10	40	100
MGCJC Faculty/Staff (243)	168	36	87	18	73	16	79	17	28	6	32	7	467	100
High School Faculty and Counselors (256)	129	36	67	18	31	9	66	18	33	9	37	10	363	100
Total	531	34	283	18	226	14	282	18	124	8	131	8	1577	100

Note: Total frequency counts may add up to more than sample size because respondents could check more than one source as being important.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

SAMPLING PROCESS

Instead of contacting all the members of each group (sometimes referred to as the "population" or "universe") for information, only a part of some groups, a sample, was contacted. The ability to make statements concerning characteristics of the population by evaluating samples has its basis in the techniques of statistical inference. There are several reasons why sampling is necessary. Two major ones are 1) the adequacy of sample results and 2) the cost of studying an entire population.

The methods of selecting a sample may be classified into two groups. They are:

1. Probability samples. A sample is considered a probability sample if all the items in the population have an equal chance of being included in the sample. The major probability sampling methods are 1) simple random sampling, 2) systematic sampling, 3) stratified random sampling, and 4) cluster sampling.

2. Nonprobability samples. If the sample is based on the judgment of the selectors rather than randomness, it is considered to be a nonprobability sample. Nonprobability sampling methods include 1) judgment sampling, 2) quota sampling, 3) convenience sampling, and 4) panel sampling.

There is no one "best" method of drawing a sample. The objective of sampling is to obtain the needed information that reflects the characteristics of the population. It is often argued that with knowledge about the population, the desired information can be obtained with a smaller sample size and with less expense by using one of the nonprobability methods. These, however, do not have the characteristic common to probability sampling

that all of the items in the population being studied have a known probability of being selected.

A questionnaire is useful in soliciting information from a population, and/or sample. It ensures that each person is asked the same questions. It assists in minimizing biases. The primary methods of administering the questionnaire include personal interview, telephone, and mail. The method selected usually depends upon the length of questionnaire, time and cost.

Statistical techniques have been developed to estimate the sample size needed in order to make statistical inferences. The sample size depends upon three factors: 1) The confidence coefficient desired. The most commonly used are 99, 95, and 90 percent. The higher the confidence desired, the larger the sample needed. 2) the allowable error. The smaller the allowable error, the larger the sample needed. 3) An estimate of the sample standard deviation. The larger the deviation, the larger the sample needed.

The technique of determining the sample size of problems involving variables and problems involving proportions is based upon the same probability concepts. The questionnaires designed to obtain information from the various groups include both variables and proportions.

It is possible to estimate the maximum sample size for problems involving proportions without knowing the standard deviations by assuming the maximum variation possible. The formula is:

$$S_p = \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}$$

Consider cases 1 and 2.

Case 1

Assume: 1) the allowable error is .03 (3 percent), 2) the confidence coefficient desired is .95 (95% confidence), 3) the maximum variation, which is $p = .50$ and $1-p = .50$

let $D = \frac{\text{allowable error}}{\text{confidence coefficient}}$ which specifies the size of the standard error permitted

$$= \frac{.03}{1.96} = .0153$$

by equating

$$D = S_p$$

$$D = \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}$$

$$D^2 = \frac{p(1-p)}{n}$$

$$\text{and } n = \frac{p(1-p)}{D^2}$$

Substituting the values for D and p into the formula gives:

$$n = \frac{.50(1-.50)}{(.0153)^2}$$

$$= \frac{.25}{.000234}$$

$$n = 1,068.$$

Case 2

Now assume: 1) the allowable error is .05 (5 percent), 2) the confidence coefficient desired is .90 (90 percent confidence), 3) the maximum variation, which is $p = .50$ and $1-p = .50$,

$$\text{then } D = \frac{.05}{1.65} = .0303$$

$$\text{and } n = \frac{.25}{(.0303)^2}$$

$$= \frac{.25}{.00092}$$

$$n = 272.$$

Thus, the range of the sample size needed based on the two sets of assumptions specified above is from 272 to 1,068.

These sample sizes are the maximum needed for an infinite population size. A correction factor is appropriate for certain finite population sizes. The finite correction factor is usually not applied unless the size of the sample is at least 5 percent of the size of the population. Let n = the initial estimate of the sample size and N = the population size. Then if the ratio of the estimated sample size to the finite population size is 5 percent or more ($\frac{n}{N}$ = 5 percent or more) the correction is in order. A formula for the correction is $n_c = \frac{n}{1 + \frac{n}{N}}$, where n_c is the corrected sample size.

In Case 1 above, the initial estimated sample size of 1,068 is 5 percent of 21,360, so the correction factor would be appropriate for population sizes of less than 21,000. In Case 2, the initial sampling size estimate of 272 is 5 percent of 5,420. The correction factor would be appropriate for populations smaller than 5,400.

For illustration, consider the survey of high school seniors. There are 3,992 seniors in the District. The adjustment in Case 1 is:

$$n_c = \frac{n}{1 + \frac{n}{N}} = \frac{1,068}{1 + \frac{1,068}{3,992}} = \frac{1,068}{1 + .268} = \frac{1,068}{1.268} = 842.$$

In Case 2 the corrected size will be

$$n_c = \frac{272}{1 + \frac{272}{3,992}} = \frac{272}{1 + .0679} = \frac{272}{1.0679} = 255$$

Thus, the adjusted sample size would range from 255 under the assumption of Case 2 to 842 under the assumptions of Case 1.

Exhibit 1 provides an example of sample sizes for conducting the community needs assessment survey of the MGCJC District. Exhibit 2 describes the sampling techniques used in conducting the actual survey. The survey results are summarized in the previous section.

Exhibit 1. Range of Estimated Sample Sizes

<u>Population in District.</u>		<u>Assumptions</u>	$\frac{n}{N}$	n_c
<u>Group</u>	<u>Size</u>		<u>Percent</u>	
Families	76,738	c 1	1.4	1,068
		c 2	0.4	272
High School Seniors	3,992	c 1	26.8	842
		c 2	6.8	255
Faculty & Staff	338	c 1	316.0	257
		c 2	80.5	151
Former Students	12,000	c 1	8.9	981
		c 2	2.3	272
Current Students	9,503	c 1	11.2	960
		c 2	2.9	272

Notes: c 1 refers to the assumptions of Case 1.

c 2 refers to the assumptions of Case 2.

n refers to the initial estimate of maximum sample size, which is 1,068 for Case 1 and 272 for Case 2.

N refers to the population size.

n_c refers to the sample size corrected for the population size. No adjustment was made unless n was greater than 5 percent of N.

Exhibit 2. Sampling Techniques

<u>Group</u>	<u>Sampling Techniques</u>
Residents	Systematic Random sampling was done by telephone using names in telephone books. If there was no answer for the number in sequence, the interviewer called the next successive number until an answer was obtained. The sample size and number of completed questionnaires was 462.
High School Students	Questionnaires were distributed on a selected day to all junior and senior high school students in attendance at high schools in the MGCJC District. The number of responses was 5,448.
MGCJC Faculty & Staff	Questionnaires were administered to all MGCJC Faculty and Staff and 243 responded.
MGCJC Former Students	Sampling was done by mail and 131 responded.
Current MGCJC Students	Questionnaires were administered to randomly chosen classes at each of the MGCJC campuses with a response of 381.
High School Faculty Counselors	Questionnaires were distributed to all eleventh and twelfth grade faculty and counselors at high schools in the MGCJC District. The number of respondents was 256.
Civic Groups	Sampling was done by mail with a response of 21.
Public Officials	Sampling was done by mail with a response of 44.
Major Employers	Survey forms were completed by means of personal interview, and 39 firms were contacted.

Appendix 2

Summary of Suggested Educational Needs MGCJC Should Attempt to Meet

	High School Faculty/Counselor	MGCJC Faculty/Staff	Former Students	Public Officials	Residents
Sample Size	256	243	131	44	462

Specific Curriculum Suggestions

Communications					1	
Computer fields	2	11	3	4	7	
Remedial programs		5	1		1	
English and Speech		2	2			
Dental Hygiene		2				
Banking and Finance		4				
Retail and Marketing		3	2			
Agriculture	1	2			1	
Electronics		2	2		1	82
Seafood Industry		1				
Preschool Child Development		1				
Energy Sources		1				
Word Processing		1				
Fine Arts		1			2	
Paralegal Technology		1				
Appliance repair		1				
Small engine repair		1				
Engineering			3			3
Athletics			1			
Nursing			2			3
Urban Planning				1		
Insurance				1		
Accounting				1		1
Physical Therapy			2			1
Vo-Tech	5		2	7		
Supervision maintenance			1			
Math	1		2			1
General Business			1			
Foreign language	1		1			
Public Relations			1			
Political Science			1			

Appendix 2

Specific Curriculum Suggestions	High School Faculty/Counselor	MGCJC Faculty/Staff	Former Students	Public Officials	Residents
Sex Education & Drug Abuse			1		
History	1				
Education	1				
Secretarial	1				
Diesel Mechanics			1		1
Science			2		
On-the-job training			1		
Non-credit offerings		4			
Hydraulics					2

Appendix 3

Summary of Suggestions and Comments to Improve MGCJC

	Former Students	MGCJC Faculty/Staff	High School Faculty/Coun.	MGCJC Students	Civic Leaders	Public Officials	Employers	Residents
Sample Size	131	243	256	381	21	44	39	462

Areas for Improvement or Change

Clerical Experience	1							
Variety in Courses	6	6		5		2	7	2
Quality of Instruction	3			9				1
Current Text Books	1							
Research Work for Students	1							
Work-Study Programs	1							
Bus Transportation	1							1
Recreational Activities	1			1				2
Job Placement	1			1				
Meals	1			1				1
Cultural Activities		3		1				
Maintenance Department	1							
Recruitment	2	3	4	1	1			
Registration	1	2		3				2
High Technology		13				5		
Continuing Ed. Courses		12						
Prov. for Vis. Handicapped		1						
Senior Citizens Programs		1						2
Media Education		1		1	1	1		8
Administrations Image		16			1			1
Internal Communication		10						
Administration & Staff		27	8					
Coop. Among Campuses		1		1		1		2
Academic Standards		6		4	3		4	
Counseling		3	5	6				1
Faculty Benefits		2						
Fitness Program		1	3					
Faculty Compensation		4						
Security		1		1				1

Appendix 3

	Former Students	MGCJC Faculty/Staff	High School Faculty/Coun.	MGCJC Students	Civic Leaders	Public Officials	Employers	Residents
Conservation		1				2		
Library Holdings		1				1		
Equipment & Facilities	1	7		16		1		
Coordination with high school			35					
Quality of Education			17				4	
Medical Aid				1				
Community Involvement							3	
Day Care Center								1
Financial Aid								2

85

UIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

JUL 13 1984

8118 Math-Sciences Building
Los Angeles, California 90024